

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1-79 are pending in the application.

The Examiner's comments on page 2 of the Office Action regarding priority are noted. However, this application already claims the benefit of the filing dates of these prior applications under 35 U.S.C. § 120 in the Combined Declaration and Power of Attorney and information data sheet that were filed with this application and in the first paragraph on page 1 of this application.

The misspelling of "moiré" on page 11, line 7 as kindly pointed out by the Examiner has been corrected. Also the first paragraph on page 25 has been amended to correct a typographical error.

Claims 4, 35 and 51 are objected to because it is unclear to the Examiner how the "at least one light output distribution is located in another light output distribution of the panel member" as recited in these claims. The Examiner is correct that in some instances when referring to multiple output distributions, the different output distributions 1 are located at different areas on the panel member. See, for example, the description on page 24, lines 26-30 and the related drawing Figures 48 and 49 which show a design/image output distribution 175 on one area of the panel member and another light output distribution 185 on another area of the panel member. However, as further explained on page 24, lines 30-32 and page 25, lines 1-11, where the design/image output distribution 175 is relatively small in relation to another light output distribution 185 of the panel member, the one output distribution may be located in the other output distribution as shown in Figs. 50 and 51 and recited in these claims. Accordingly, withdrawal of this objection is respectfully requested.

Claims 33 and 58 have been amended to correct the informalities in these claims noted by the Examiner.

Claims 1-4 and 11-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Hardesty (U.S. Patent 2,831,453). According to the Examiner, Hardesty discloses a light emitting panel having at least one pattern of individual optical deformities (the re-entrant grooves or depressions 12b shown in Fig. 2) on at least one surface area of the panel member for producing at least one light output distribution from the panel member having a form and/or shape of at least one of text, graphics, logo or image. However, the optical deformities 12 of Hardesty merely redirect some of the light toward translucent indicia 18 placed in optical contact with the opposite surface of the light transmitting panel 12 through an opening formed in the metallic coating 13a. See, for example, column 4, lines 3-13 of Hardesty. They are not a pattern of individual optical deformities that produces at least one light output distribution having a form or shape of at least one of text, graphics, logo or image as recited in claim 1. Accordingly, claim 1 is submitted as clearly allowable.

Claims 2-4 and 11-13 depend from claim 1 and are submitted as allowable for substantially the same reasons. Moreover, claims 2 and 3 further patentably distinguish over Hardesty by reciting that the individual optical deformities of the pattern surround an outline of each element of the text, graphics, logo or image or the pattern of individual optical deformities is in the shape of each element of the text, graphics or logo. Also claims 4 and 13 further patentably distinguish over Hardesty by reciting that the one light output distribution is located in another light output distribution to create a watermark, security marking, label or other effect in the other output distribution having

the form or shape of the text, graphics, logo or image. In Hardesty, none of the light output distributions are located in another light output distribution of the panel member as recited in these claims.

Claims 36, 37, 39, 42 and 43 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Hardesty. However, claim 36 recites at least one pattern of individual optical deformities on or in at least one surface area of the panel member for producing at least one light output distribution having a form or shape of at least one of text, graphics, logo or image, similar to claim 1, and is submitted as allowable for substantially the same reasons.

Claims 37, 39, 42 and 43 depend from claim 36 and are submitted as allowable for substantially the same reasons. Moreover, at least claim 37 further patentably distinguishes over Hardesty by reciting that the one light output distribution of claim 36 is located in another light output distribution to create a watermark, security marking, label or other effect in the other output distribution having the form or shape of at least one of text, graphics, logo or image. This is clearly not disclosed in Hardesty for the reasons previously discussed.

Claims 58-60 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Hardesty. However, these claims clearly patentably distinguish over Hardesty by reciting, *inter alia*, that the light output distribution that is produced by the pattern of individual optical deformities has a form or shape of at least one of text, graphics, logo or image, which is clearly not disclosed in Hardesty for the reasons previously discussed.

Moreover, claim 60 further patentably distinguishes over Hardesty by reciting that the one output distribution is located in another output distribution to create a watermark, security marking, label or other effect on the other output distribution having the form or shape of text, graphics, logo or image.

Claims 1-35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pristash et al (U.S. Patent 5,005,108) in view of Schoniger (U.S. Patent 5,027,258). Admittedly Pristash teaches multiple light output distributions 77-79 in Fig. 10 from which the light output pattern or uniformity of light output may be controlled by varying the shape, depth and frequency of the deformities 87 relative to the input light ray distribution.

However, the Examiner acknowledges that Pristash does not teach that the light output distribution that is produced by the claimed pattern of individual optical deformities has a form or shape of at least one of text, graphics, logo or image. For this feature, the Examiner relies on the teaching in Schoniger of a light guide having logo symbols 13, contending that the symbols are implicitly formed by deformities on a surface. However, the logo symbols 13 of Schoniger are either adhesively attached films or vapor coatings or are molded or milled into the panel so light leaves the panel at the milled surface and illuminates it (column 4, lines 28-35). These are not patterns of individual optical deformities on or in at least one surface area of the panel members for producing at least one light output distribution having a form or shape of at least one of text, graphics, logo or image as recited in claims 1-35. Accordingly, claims 1-35 are submitted as allowable for at least these reasons.

Moreover, at least claims 2-7, 10, 13, 20-28 and 33-35 recite other novel features in the claimed combination nowhere disclosed or suggested in the cited references. Claim 2 recites that the individual optical deformities of the pattern surround an outline of each element of the text, graphics, logo or image, whereas claim 3 recites that the pattern of individual optical deformities is in the shape of each element of the text, graphics or logo. Claims 4 and 13 recite that the one light output distribution is located in another light output distribution of the panel member to create a watermark, security marking, label or other effect in the other output distribution having the form or shape of the text, graphics, logo or image. Also claims 5-7 recite that the optical deformities of the one pattern are varied in at least one of the claimed characteristics in order to obtain the one light output distribution having a form or shape of at least one of text, graphics, logo or image.

Claim 10 recites that the panel member has two input edges at opposite ends of the panel member that receive light from different colored light sources, and that at least some of the deformities in the pattern are shaped or oriented preferentially to cause the different colored light received by the two input edges to create at least one multi-colored output distribution. Admittedly Schoniger teaches illuminating elements in the form of LEDs that may be in different colors and may be switched on or off or dimmed to produce a large number of different colors and hues by mixing effects. Also Schoniger teaches that it is possible to associate different light guide battens with different parts of the light guide panel having a plurality of different colored illuminating elements for illuminating these different zones of the light guide panel and different variations in different colors. However, nowhere in Schoniger does it teach providing at

least some of deformities in a pattern that are shaped or oriented preferentially to cause different colored light that is received by the two input edges at opposite ends of the panel member to create a multi-colored output distribution as recited in claim 10.

Claims 20-28 recite a plurality of panel members in overlying relation to one another each having a different light output distribution that together produce at least one composite output distribution when viewed through the panel members from one side. Admittedly Figs. 2 and 5 of Schoniger teach two light guide panels 10 in overlying relation to each other each having logo symbols 13 arranged on the rear faces of the light guides to cause light to exit therefrom. However, a contrast panel 19 is arranged between the light guide panels in order to achieve contrast between the illuminated logo symbols 13 and the background so that they may be read from either side of the display (column 5, lines 52-60). Thus the two panel members of Schoniger do not have different light output distributions that together produce at least one composite output distribution when viewed through the panel members from one side as recited in these claims.

Moreover, Schoniger does not teach providing each of the panel members with light from a different colored light source to produce a multi-colored composite output distribution when viewed through the panel members from the one side as recited in claim 23, or of providing an output distribution from each of the panel members that produces one or more parts of a more complex output distribution that is visible through the panel members from the one side as recited in claim 24. Nor does Schoniger teach making the intensity of the output distribution of each of the panel members different to create at least one multi-intensity composite output distribution that is visible through

the panel members from the one side as recited in claim 25, or of providing a display overlying the one side of the overlying panel members so that the output distributions of the overlying panel members is visible through the display as recited in claims 26-28, or of providing a light redirecting film between the display and one of the panel members that allows different light output distributions to be seen when the panel members are viewed through the display from different angles as further recited in claim 28.

Also, Schoniger does not teach providing additional optical deformities on the side of the panel member opposite the side having the one pattern of optical deformities that allow different output distributions to be seen when the panel member is viewed from different angles through the opposite side as recited in claims 33-35.

Claims 36-44 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pristash in view of Schoniger. However, claim 36 recites that the pattern of individual optical deformities on or in at least one surface area of the panel member produces at least one light output distribution having a form or shape of at least one of text, graphics, logo or image substantially as recited in claim 1 and is submitted as allowable for substantially the same reasons.

Claims 37-44 depend from claim 36 and are submitted as allowable for substantially the same reasons. Moreover, at least claims 37 and 38 further patentably distinguish over the cited references, claim 36 by reciting that the one light output distribution is located in another light output distribution of the panel member to create a watermark, security marking, label or other effect in the other output distribution having the form or shape of at least one of text, graphics, logo or image, and claim 38 by

reciting that the optical deformities of the one pattern are varied in at least one of the noted respects to produce the claimed light output distribution.

Claims 45-57 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pristash et al in view of Schoniger. However, claim 45 recites that at least the one light output distribution that is produced by the pattern of individual optical deformities on or in at least one surface area of the panel member has a form or shape of at least one of text, graphics, logo or image substantially as recited in claim 1 and is submitted as allowable for substantially the same reasons.

Claims 46-57 depend from claim 45 and are submitted as allowable for substantially the same reasons. Moreover, claims 49 and 50 further patentably distinguish over the cited references by reciting that the panel member has two input edges at opposite ends of the panel member that receive light from two different colored light sources to obtain the one output distribution. Also, claim 50 further recites that different ones of the deformities are shaped or oriented preferentially to cause the different colored light received by the different input edges to create a multi-colored output distribution, in a manner clearly nowhere disclosed or suggested in the cited references. Claim 51 further patentably distinguishes over the cited references by reciting that the one light output distribution is located in another light output distribution of the panel member to create a watermark, security marking, label or other effect in the other output distribution having the form or shape of the text, graphics, logo or image.

Claims 58-66 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pristash in view of Schoniger. However, claim 58 recites that the light output distribution that is produced by the pattern of individual optical deformities on or in one

surface area of the panel member has a form or shape of at least one of text, graphics, logo or image substantially as recited in claim 1 and is submitted as allowable for substantially the same reasons.

Claims 59-66 depend from claim 58 and are also submitted as clearly allowable. Moreover, at least claim 60 further patentably distinguishes over the cited references by reciting that the one output distribution is located in another output distribution to create a watermark, security marking, label or other effect on the other output distribution having the form or shape of text, graphics, logo or image.

Claims 67-75 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pristash in view of Schoniger. However, claim 67 clearly patentably distinguishes over these references by reciting, in combination, two light emitting panel members, one having a pattern of individual optical deformities on one surface area of the panel member for producing a light output distribution having a form or shape of at least one of text, graphics, logo or image, and the other having at least one light output distribution, the panel members being in overlying relation to one another for producing a composite output distribution when viewed through the panel members from one side.

Claims 68-75 depend from claim 67 and further patentably distinguish over the cited references by reciting other novel features in the claimed combination. Claim 68 recites that the output distribution of each of the panel members is different. Claim 69 recites that the output distribution of the other panel member is in the form or shape of at least one of text, graphics, logo or image. Claim 70 recites that each of the panel members receives light from at least one different colored light source to produce at least one multi-colored composite output distribution when viewed through the panel

members from the one side. Claim 71 recites that the output distribution of each of the panel members produces one or more parts of a more complex output distribution that is visible through the panel members from the one side. Claim 72 recites that the intensity of at least one output distribution of each of the panel members is different and creates at least one multi-intensity composite output distribution that is visible through the panel members. Claims 73-75 recite that the assembly further comprises a display overlying the panel members, and that the output distributions of the panel members is visible through the display. Also claim 75 further recites that at least one light redirecting film is between the display and one of the panel members that allows different light output distributions to be seen when the panel members are viewed through the display from different angles.

Claims 76-79 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pristash in view of Schoniger. However, claim 76 clearly patentably distinguishes over the cited references by reciting, *inter alia*, that the panel member has a pattern of individual optical deformities on or in each side of the panel member, each of which produces a light output distribution from the panel member having a form or shape of at least one of text, graphics, logo or image.

Claims 77-79 depend from claim 76 and further patentably distinguish over the cited references, claim 77 by reciting that the two output distributions produce at least one composite light output distribution when viewed through the panel member from one side, claim 78 by reciting that the two output distributions produce two separate and distinct output distributions when viewed through the panel member from one side, and

claim 79 reciting that the two output distributions are separately viewable through the panel member from different angles from one side.

For at least the foregoing reasons, this application is now believed to be in condition for final allowance of all of the pending claims 1-79, and early action to that end is earnestly solicited. Should the Examiner disagree with applicants' attorney in any respect, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner telephone applicants' attorney in an effort to resolve such differences.

In the event that an extension of time is necessary, this should be considered a petition for such an extension. If required, fees are enclosed for the extension of time and/or for the presentation of new and/or amended claims. In the event any additional fees are due in connection with the filing of this reply, the Commissioner is authorized to charge those fees to our Deposit Account No. 18-0988 (Attorney Docket GLOLP0108USG).

Respectfully submitted,

RENNER, OTTO, BOISSELLE & SKLAR, LLP

By 

Donald L. Otto
Registration No. 22,125

1621 Euclid Avenue
Nineteenth Floor
Cleveland, Ohio 44115-2191
Phone: 216-621-1113
Fax: 216-621-6165

Z:\SEC177\GLOLP108USG\REPLY TO OA OF 11-16-04.wpd